

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 22, 23, 29, 30, and 32 are amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, for example, on pages 5-7. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Claims 1-24 and 29-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 6,282,713 issued to Kitsukawa and U.S. Patent 6,247,047 to Wolff. In addition, claims 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kitsukawa, Wolff, and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0062254 to Matsko. However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Kitsukawa, Wolff, or Matsko, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in claims 1-33.

Specifically, none of Kitsukawa, Wolff, or Matsko, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in independent claims 1, 8, 12, 14, and 32, including, in relevant part, automatically selecting at least one version of said plurality of versions based on said previously collected and stored preference information.

Similarly, none of Kitsukawa, Wolff, or Matsko, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in independent claims 6 and 10, including, in relevant part, a program that automatically selects one version of said products based on said previously collected and stored preference information.

Furthermore, none of Kitsukawa, Wolff, or Matsko, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in independent claims 22 and 29, including, in relevant part, a program that automatically selects at least one version of said product based on said previously collected and stored preference information if a plurality of versions of said product exist.

In particular, as was correctly stated by the Examiner, Kitsukawa fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious checking if a plurality of versions exist for the product contained within the product advertising message, comparing the plurality of versions with preference

information associated with the viewer and selecting at least one version of the plurality of versions using the preference information.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions that Wolff discloses these features, Applicants respectfully submit that Wolff also fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious a system or method that automatically selecting a version of a said plurality of versions based on previously collected and stored preference information related to a user. Instead, Wolff merely discloses a system that "presents information to the user relating to the advertised product or service" including "available user options (e.g., color, size, model)" and "requests user input data from the user" including "user order information (e.g., product selection data such as color, size, model, quantity, etc.)." (Col. 9, lines 28-42). Wolff also specifically discloses that the above information is "entered by the user." (Col. 9, line 44). There is no suggestions whatsoever in Wolff that the system is capable of automatically selecting appropriate versions of the product based on previously collected and stored preference information related to the user. Matsko also fails to disclose these features.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Kitsukawa, Wolff, or Matsko, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 22, 29, and 32. Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kitsukawa and Wolff, or Kitsukawa, Wolff, and or Matsko should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15-21, 23-28, 30-31, and 33 are allowable based on their dependency on claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 22, 29, and 32, respectively, and also on their own merits. Therefore, the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kitsukawa and Wolff, or Kitsukawa, Wolff, and or Matsko should also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 18, 2007

/Stephen M. Hertzler, Reg. No. 58,247/
Stephen M. Hertzler

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000